

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Stephanie Toma	Team: Squad #01	CCRB Case #: 202207747	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 11/06/2022 1:00 PM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	18 Mo. SOL 5/6/2024	Precinct: 45		
Date/Time CV Reported Mon, 11/07/2022 10:19 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 11/14/2022 8:28 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Witness(es)	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. PO Steven Morrow	30092	965355	045 PCT
2. PO Brandon Fennell	19836	963983	045 PCT
3. PO Emilio Perez	11652	967248	045 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. PO Glasjun Pereyra	09368	965407	045 PCT
2. PO Danny Padilla	09352	965390	045 PCT
3. PO James Olson	26339	946078	045 PCT
4. PO Michael Hughes	17052	969125	045 PCT
5. PO Ariel Francisco	02417	970526	045 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A. PO Steven Morrow	Abuse: Police Officer Steven Morrow stopped § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B. PO Brandon Fennell	Abuse: Police Officer Brandon Fennell stopped § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
C. PO Steven Morrow	Abuse: Police Officer Steven Morrow seized § 87(2)(b) property.	§ 87(2)(b)
D. PO Steven Morrow	Abuse: Police Officer Steven Morrow refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
E. PO Brandon Fennell	Abuse: Police Officer Brandon Fennell refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
F. PO Steven Morrow	Abuse: Police Officer Steven Morrow refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
G. PO Brandon Fennell	Abuse: Police Officer Brandon Fennell refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
H. PO Steven Morrow	Discourtesy: Police Officer Steven Morrow spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
I. PO Steven Morrow	Discourtesy: Police Officer Steven Morrow spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
J. PO Steven Morrow	Abuse: Police Officer Steven Morrow failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	§ 87(2)(b)
K. PO Brandon Fennell	Abuse: Police Officer Brandon Fennell failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	§ 87(2)(b)

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
L.P.O Emilio Perez	Abuse: Police Officer Emilio Perez damaged § 87(2)(b) property.	

Case Summary

On November 7, 2022, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB). On November 14, 2022, this complaint was received at the CCRB.

On November 6, 2022, at approximately 1:00 PM, § 87(2)(b) was outside of § 87(2)(b) in the Bronx when Police Officers Steven Morrow and Brandon Fennell, both from the 45th Precinct, stopped him (**Allegations A and B: Abuse of Authority-** § 87(2)(g) PO Morrow seized § 87(2)(b) property (**Allegation C: Abuse of Authority-** § 87(2)(g) § 87(2)(b) PO Morrow and PO Fennell refused to provide their names and shield numbers to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations D, E, F, and G: Abuse of Authority-** § 87(2)(g) PO Morrow spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations H and I: Discourtesy-** § 87(2)(g) PO Morrow and PO Fennell did not provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card (**Allegations J and K: Abuse of Authority-** § 87(2)(g) Officers damaged § 87(2)(b) property (**Allegation L: Abuse of Authority-** § 87(2)(g) There was no arrest and no summons issued.

Seven body worn camera (BWC) videos were received in relation to this incident (**Board Reviews 01, 04-07**). § 87(2)(b) provided five cell phone videos in relation to the incident (**Board Reviews 21- 27**).

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Steven Morrow stopped § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Brandon Fennell stopped § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Steven Morrow seized § 87(2)(b) property.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that he wheeled his E-bike up a ramp from his apartment's basement onto the sidewalk (**Board Review 02**). § 87(2)(b) E-bike was a black and red Ducati (**Board Review 23**). § 87(2)(b) E-bike was not registered and had a fake vanity plate. The E-bike needed a key to run and had a speedometer that displayed the speed of the E-bike, which maxed out at 35 miles per hour. § 87(2)(b) modified his E-bike to remove the pedals. § 87(2)(b) sat on his E-bike, on the sidewalk, while he spoke on the phone. He did not put his key in the bike or start it up at any point. While § 87(2)(b) was seated on his bike, PO Morrow and PO Fennell approached him. PO Morrow asked § 87(2)(b) to stand up, then asked for his license and registration for the motorbike. § 87(2)(b) told PO Morrow that he did not have a license and that the vehicle was not a motorbike, but an E-bike. § 87(2)(b) handed PO Morrow his non-driver's ID and a slip that he received from the dealer who sold him the E-bike which contained the date the E-bike was purchased, the E-bike's VIN, and the phone number of the dealership (**Board Review 28**). PO Morrow walked away with § 87(2)(b) E-bike receipt and ID and made a call while § 87(2)(b) waited with PO Fennell. PO Morrow returned and at some point, the officers mentioned that § 87(2)(b) license was suspended. After talking to PO Morrow and PO Fennell for about 30 minutes, PO Danny Padilla, and PO Glasjun Pereyra, from the 45th Precinct, arrived. PO Padilla told § 87(2)(b) that the bike did not belong on the sidewalk. PO Padilla asked if the vehicle had a 15-digit VIN and PO Pereyra went to check the location of the VIN. PO Pereyra looked at the VIN and told PO Padilla that it was a 15-digit VIN. § 87(2)(b) told the officers that it was a 17-digit VIN, and that they could see it on the E-bike receipt which read VIN § 87(2)(b) (**Board Review 28**). PO Padilla told § 87(2)(b) that they were going to have to confiscate his bike because of the 15-digit VIN.

PO Morrow's BWC footage at 00:38 of the video player's timestamp captures § 87(2)(b) sitting on his E-bike with his helmet on, on the sidewalk (**Board Review 04**).

PO Fennell's BWC footage from 07:00 to 07:18 captures PO Morrow ask § 87(2)(b) for his driver's license (**Board Review 05**). § 87(2)(b) gives PO Morrow his ID but says he does not have

a driver's license because you do not need one for the E-bike. PO Morrow says, "the issue is because it has a VIN number, it is required to be registered with the DMV." § 87(2)(b) says, "I went there, and they told me I can't."

PO Padilla's BWC footage from 04:34 to 04:50 captures PO Pereyra ask § 87(2)(b) if he registered the plates on the E-bike and § 87(2)(b) says no (**Board Review 06**). PO Pereyra tells § 87(2)(b) that he cannot park the bike on the sidewalk illegally.

PO Fennel testified that he and PO Morrow were doing an overtime scooter initiative to patrol for unregistered scooters. PO Morrow and PO Fennell saw § 87(2)(b) on an E-bike on the sidewalk. The license plate on the E-bike looked like a memorabilia license plate gift that is sold at a store which is usually not real (**Board Review 30**).

PO Morrow testified that he and PO Fennell were in their vehicle on Westchester Avenue when they noticed § 87(2)(b) on a motorcycle on the sidewalk on Roland Avenue (**Board Review 03**). § 87(2)(b) had a helmet on, and the motorcycle was running but was not moving at the time. The officers exited their vehicle and approached him because he was operating a motorcycle on the sidewalk. PO Morrow asked § 87(2)(b) to turn off the motorcycle and to provide his license and registration and § 87(2)(b) did. PO Morrow reviewed the paperwork to see if it was registration for the motorcycle and determined that it was not, and it was a receipt from a store that stated, "I sold this guy an E-bike." PO Morrow was also able to determine that it was an E-bike because it had a large battery underneath the seat and while it was running, it did not make any noise. PO Morrow called PO Pereyra and PO Padilla, auto crime trained officers, to the location so that they could assist in the investigation. PO Morrow ran § 87(2)(b) license and license plate while waiting for them and he found that the license plate was fake and § 87(2)(b) driver's license was suspended for violations committed on E-bikes. When PO Pereyra and PO Padilla arrived, they located the VIN number for the E-bike and confirmed that the E-bike was not registered. PO Morrow made the decision to seize § 87(2)(b) E-bike because § 87(2)(b) was in violation of several laws including that the E-bike was not registered, he had no insurance, and he had a fake license plate on the E-bike. PO Morrow told § 87(2)(b) that the E-bike would be brought back to the 45th Precinct stationhouse.

Per the New York Department of Transportation, an E-bike must have operable pedals and a max speed of 25 miles per hour, otherwise it is classified as a "moped," or limited use motorcycle (**Board Review 10**). New York Vehicle and Traffic Laws § 125 and § 123 define motor vehicles and motorcycles, respectively (**Board Reviews 11, 12**). A motor vehicle is a vehicle operated on a public highway which is propelled by any power that is not muscular power. A motorcycle is a motor vehicle with a seat or saddle for the rider and designed to travel on not more than three wheels. Per New York Vehicle and Traffic Law § 410, all motorcycles must be registered prior to operation upon public highways (**Board Review 14**). New York Vehicle and Traffic Law § 1250 states that traffic laws apply to persons operating motorcycles (**Board Review 15**). Per the Rules of the City of New York Title 34 Chapter 4-08(e)(3) (page 6), stopping, standing or parking is prohibited on sidewalks (**Board Review 13**). Per NY CLS Penal § 170.20 (a misdemeanor) a person is guilty of criminal possession of a forged instrument in the third degree when, with knowledge that it is forged and with intent to deceive another, he possesses a forged instrument (**Board Review 35**). NYC Administrative Code § 14-140(b) permits officers to seize any property held or used in violation of law (**Board Review 29**).

Per the New York Department of Transportation and New York Vehicle and Traffic Laws, the investigation found that § 87(2)(b) E-bike would be classified as a "moped," or limited use motorcycle. Per the consistency between § 87(2)(b) testimony and PO Morrow's BWC, § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) vehicle was in violation of Rules of the City of New York Title 34 Chapter 4-08 section (e)(3) as he was stopped on a sidewalk. The officers subsequently confirmed that his license plate was fake and additionally determined that his motorcycle was not registered. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

Because § 87(2)(b) moped/limited use motorcycle was, per his own statement, on the sidewalk and unregistered, he was therefore illegally operating his vehicle in violation of the Rules of the City of New York Title 34 Chapter 4-08(e)(3) and New York Vehicle and Traffic Law § 410. Per NYC Administrative Code § 14-140(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Steven Morrow refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Brandon Fennell refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Steven Morrow refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Brandon Fennell refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) testified that while PO Morrow was looking at his ID and paperwork, he requested PO Morrow's name and badge number directly (**Board Review 02**). PO Morrow told § 87(2)(b) that he would provide it in a minute. § 87(2)(b) then told PO Fennell, "I want the same thing from you." PO Fennell responded that he would provide it in a bit. Neither officer provided their identifying information and § 87(2)(b) did not request that information from them again.

PO Morrow's BWC footage from 07:00 to 09:00 captures PO Morrow ask § 87(2)(b) for his driver's license and § 87(2)(b) says that he has his ID but that he does not have a driver's license (**Board Review 04**). § 87(2)(b) hands PO Morrow his ID and then PO Glasjun Pereyra and PO Danny Padilla arrive. § 87(2)(b) does not ask PO Morrow or PO Fennell for their names or shield numbers.

The entire interaction between § 87(2)(b) PO Morrow, and PO Fennell is captured on PO Morrow and PO Fennell's BWC (**Board Reviews 04, 05**). At no point did § 87(2)(b) ask PO Morrow or PO Fennell for their names or shield numbers.

§ 87(2)(g) the entire interaction was captured on BWC and § 87(2)(b) never asked PO Morrow or PO Fennell for their names or shield numbers. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)

Allegation (H) Discourtesy: Police Officer Steven Morrow spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (I) Discourtesy: Police Officer Steven Morrow spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) did not allege that PO Morrow spoke discourteously to him; however, PO Morrow's BWC footage captured him curse at § 87(2)(b) (**Board Review 04**). From 14:45 to 16:41 in PO Morrow's BWC footage, § 87(2)(b) argues with the officers about them taking his E-bike and the officers explain that it is too late for § 87(2)(b) to put the E-bike back in the basement. § 87(2)(b) grabs his belongings off the E-bike. From 16:42 to 16:49 PO Morrow tells § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b) is "fucking with [them]". From 17:18 to 17:29 PO Morrow tells § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b) is

“bullshitting [them]” by saying that he takes the bike to work every day.

PO Morrow testified that he told § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b) was fucking with him when he found out § 87(2)(b) license was suspended for illegally operating E-bikes since § 87(2)(b) had initially and repeatedly told the officers that he did not know that E-bikes were illegal (**Board Review 03**). PO Morrow believed that § 87(2)(b) should have had full knowledge that his E-bike was illegal as he had gotten in trouble for it before, but § 87(2)(b) kept saying he did not know. There was no other reason why PO Morrow decided to use the words “fucking with.” PO Morrow similarly told § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b) was “bullshitting” them because § 87(2)(b) was not being truthful.

Per NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 200-02, officers are expected to maintain a higher standard of integrity than is generally expected of others, respect the dignity of each individual, and render services with courtesy and civility (**Board Review 17**).

DCT Case No. 2013-10143 states that profanity has been found to be permissible where the officer has resorted to such language in the heat of a highly dangerous situation (**Board Review 18**).

PO Morrow testified that he told § 87(2)(b) that he was bullshitting and fucking with the officers as a response to believing that § 87(2)(b) was being untruthful. Per DCT Case No. 2013-10143 and Patrol Guide Procedure 200-02, absent a highly dangerous situation, officers are expected to treat others courteously. PO Morrow’s displeasure with § 87(2)(b) perceived untruthfulness did not rise to the level of a highly dangerous situation and BWC did not otherwise capture evidence of a dangerous situation. § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (J) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Steven Morrow failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

Allegation (K) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Brandon Fennell failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

Though § 87(2)(b) did not make an allegation, PO Morrow’s and PO Fennell’s body-worn camera footage does not capture them provide business cards to § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) was neither arrested nor summonsed (**Board Reviews 04, 05**). No other officer’s body-worn camera captures them provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card (**Board Review 01**).

PO Morrow testified that he told § 87(2)(b) that the officers were not arresting him for the fake license plate nor were they issuing summonses for the other violations (**Board Review 03**). PO Morrow and PO Fennell did not provide § 87(2)(b) with business cards.

PO Fennell testified that he did not recall if any officer issued § 87(2)(b) a summons but he did not issue him one (**Board Review 30**). He did not provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card because § 87(2)(b) did not ask him for one. PO Fennell’s understanding of when an officer needs to provide a civilian with a business card is when there is a police interaction and the civilian asks for one, or if a stop report is filled out. PO Fennell stated that there may be other times an officer needs to provide one, but he did not recall when. PO Fennell did not believe that he was required to provide a business card during this incident since he was not asked for one. PO Fennell did not recall if any officer provided § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

Per Administrative Guide 304-11, officers must offer a business card following stops where they have a reasonable suspicion that the person stopped has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime and where a reasonable person would not feel free to end the encounter and which do not result in an arrest or summons (**Board Review 32**).

Per body-worn camera footage and officers' testimony, PO Morrow and PO Fennell did not provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card even though they stopped him, in part for suspicion that his license plate was fake (see Allegations A/B), and he was not arrested or issued a summons as a result. Therefore, they did not comply with Administrative Guide 304-11, § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (L) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Emilio Perez damaged § 87(2)(b) property.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that a third unit, consisting of PO Michael Hughes and PO James Olson, from the 45th Precinct, arrived (**Board Review 02**). About 10 minutes later, PO Emilio Perez, from the 45th Precinct, arrived in a marked van. PO Padilla informed § 87(2)(b) again that they would be taking his bike. PO Padilla asked § 87(2)(b) for the keys to his bike so that he could ride the bike to the stationhouse, as otherwise it would need to be put in the van and might get damaged. § 87(2)(b) told the officers that he did not have the keys to his bike although he did. PO Hughes, PO Olson, and PO Perez lifted § 87(2)(b) bike into the back of the van, then one of the officers pushed it to get it in further. No officer lifted the kickstand of § 87(2)(b) bike, nor did they properly secure it. § 87(2)(b) believed that the officers were treating his bike roughly because he did not provide his keys to them. Before the bike was seized, it was completely undamaged, but upon receiving it back both sideview mirrors were broken, the speakers were damaged (one was scratched and one was nonfunctional), and there were one or two big scratches on the right side of his bike. § 87(2)(b) provided a video of his bike during his interaction with the officers before they seized it, and the bike appears to be in good condition and both sideview mirrors are undamaged (**Board Review 23**). § 87(2)(b) provided a video showing damage to his bike after he received it back (**Board Review 25**). 00:03 captures that the reflective portion of the left mirror is missing. 00:07 captures visible scratches on the right side of the bike. § 87(2)(b) also provided a picture of the scratches on the right side of his bike (**Board Review 20**). § 87(2)(b) returned to the dealer and paid for repairs for the bike. § 87(2)(b) failed to provide documentation of the repairs.

PO Fennell's BWC footage from 05:44 to 05:49 captures § 87(2)(b) bike in good condition (**Board Review 05**). Neither mirror is broken and there is no other apparent damage to the bike. 13:22 to 13:30 captures PO Padilla ask § 87(2)(b) for the keys to the E-bike and § 87(2)(b) says that he does not have the keys. PO Padilla tells § 87(2)(b) "I can ride it back and keep it safe or we can just throw it in the back of the van."

PO Perez's BWC footage from 01:40 to 02:13 captures the officers load the bike into the back of the van (**Board Review 07**). PO Perez opens the right-side door of the van to pull the bike in from the front and then puts the kickstand down, keeping the bike standing up. PO Perez shakes the bike a few times. The bike stays stable, and no further adjustments to the bike are made. The bike is not strapped down. At 03:00 PO Perez drives the bike back to the stationhouse in the van with PO Ariel Francisco, from the 45th Precinct. At 03:07 PO Perez says that § 87(2)(b) is definitely going to file a CCRB complaint and would definitely claim damage to the bike. At 03:35 PO Perez says "I gotta make sure that bike does not fucking move." At 05:00 the BWC captures the sound of a loud crash and glass breaking as PO Perez turns the steering wheel. The speedometer is not visible. PO Perez gasps and PO Francisco says, "I don't even want to look." PO Perez says, "we are taking this bike back, oh fuck." PO Francisco says, "that sounded really bad." PO Perez groans and says "it is what it is, what is he going to claim, that it's fucking broken? Yeah, it broke in the fucking van. How did damage occur? While in transport." The officers say the damage will be recorded in the property voucher. PO Perez says, "I tried, I went super slow."

PO Morrow prepared property voucher § 87(2)(b) for § 87(2)(b) E-bike and processed it as

“determine true owner” (**Board Review 19**). Under the damage description, the voucher says, “numerous scratches on body, mirror broken”.

PO Morrow testified that PO Padilla told § 87(2)(b) that the officers could put the E-bike in the back of the van and transport it back to the stationhouse, or § 87(2)(b) could give PO Padilla the keys to the E-bike and PO Padilla would drive the E-bike back to the stationhouse (**Board Review 03**). § 87(2)(b) said he did not know where his keys were, so PO Morrow and the other officers waited for the van. PO Perez and PO Francisco loaded the E-bike into the van, which did not have any seats other than the driver and passenger seats. PO Morrow did not load the E-bike into the van, but PO Morrow was there when the officers put the E-bike inside the van, and he saw them lift it up and roll it towards the front. PO Morrow did not observe any damage occur to the E-bike as it was being placed in the van. PO Morrow did not recall if the condition of the E-bike was the same before and after it was vouchered and did not recall what the specific damage listed on the voucher was. PO Morrow was shown his body-worn camera footage from 01:17 to 01:22. PO Morrow stated that he did not see any damage to the left mirror but maintained that he did not know how the damage listed on the property voucher occurred and whether it had been there before it was vouchered.

PO Perez testified that he and PO Francisco were the officers responsible for transporting the illegal bikes back to the stationhouse since they had the van (**Board Review 31**). PO Perez and other officers opened the van’s back doors and put § 87(2)(b) E-bike inside. PO Perez put the kickstand down to make sure the E-bike was sturdy enough for the ride as this is their typical procedure. § 87(2)(b) kickstand was working properly, and the E-bike felt sturdy after the kickstand was put down. PO Perez and the officers at the scene did not do anything else to ensure the safety of the E-bike. There was no way for the officers to have strapped down the E-bike as officers are not provided with straps or any other equipment to transport E-bikes. PO Perez and PO Francisco took the E-bike back to the stationhouse in the van to be vouchered. PO Perez drove slowly and followed traffic. As PO Perez made a turn, § 87(2)(b) E-bike fell over. Once back at the stationhouse, PO Perez noticed that one of the mirrors on the E-bike was broken. PO Perez did not notice any other damage to the E-bike. PO Perez was not required to document the damage sustained to the E-bike anywhere. PO Perez did not interact with § 87(2)(b) E-bike further. PO Perez did not intentionally damage the mirror of § 87(2)(b) E-bike. PO Perez did not know if there was a procedure officers should follow when transporting property such as E-bikes back to the stationhouse. PO Perez followed his supervisor’s directions which was to transport the E-bikes back to the 45th Precinct stationhouse in the van. PO Perez did not receive any training on how to bring E-bikes back to the stationhouse.

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 202-02 states that the operator of a police vehicle should operate the vehicle in a manner to avoid injury to person or damage to property, but it does not provide specifics on how to do so (**Board Review 33**).

§ 87(2)(b) testimony, PO Perez’s testimony, the BWC footage, the property voucher, and the picture/video provided by § 87(2)(b) are consistent in that there was damage to § 87(2)(b) E-bike. § 87(2)(g)

Although PO Perez testified that he put down the kickstand and did not receive instructions or training which instructed him to do otherwise, but common knowledge would indicate that a slight bump or turn could cause the E-bike to fall over and result in damage. PO Perez also made comments while he drove stating that he needed to ensure the E-bike did not move, acknowledging that that was a possibility. Although PO Perez testified that the damage caused to the bike was not intentional, his carelessness and failure to properly secure the E-bike resulted in the damage. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- PO Morrow has been a member of service for five years and has been a subject in two other CCRB complaints and seven other allegations, of which one was substantiated.
 - 202107599 involved a substantiated allegation of failure to provide RTKA card and the NYPD imposed formalized training.
- PO Fennell has been a member of service for five years and has been a subject in four other CCRB complaints and nine other allegations, of which one was substantiated.
 - 20217599 involved a substantiated allegation of failure to provide RTKA card and the NYPD imposed formalized training.

• § 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- As of June 27, 2023, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim filed in regard to this incident (**Board Review 16**).

• [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Squad: 1

Investigator:	<u>Inv. Stephanie Toma</u>	<u>Inv. Stephanie Toma</u>	<u>01/03/2024</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	<u>Mgr. Joy Almeyda</u>	<u></u>	<u>01.04.2024</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer:	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date